UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,456	12/14/2000	Gregory Peter Davis	AUS920000777US1	1620

7590 08/10/2004

Intellectual Property Law Dept.
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road, Zip 4054
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER	
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2654	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/737,456	DAVIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas E Shortledge	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-17, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Watanabe et al. (6,185,729).

As to claims 1 and 7, Watanabe et al. teach:

A device for inputting a message in a first language using an input device, said first language having first language characters wherein each character is represented with single byte (a keyboard available as an input device, input being a single byte language col. 9, lines 8-9, and col. 7, lines 46);

A device for translating said message into a pseudo language, said pseudo language being comprised of pseudo language characters wherein each characters images into said application (creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, col. 8, lines 5-6);

inputting said pseudo language character images into said application, and displaying said pseudo language character images using said application (using multi byte English local, the developer can immediately test for problems and correct the software before the software is released, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claims 2 and 8, Watanabe et al. teach said pseudo language character images are graphically similar to said first language characters so as to be recognizable in said stop of displaying (creating a multi byte locale for a single byte language, it is desirable to build in features which permit ready identification of errors, col. 8, lines 5-10).

As to claim 3, Watanabe et al. teach translating each of said first language characters into a corresponding pseudo language characters (creating a multi

byte language that represents a single byte U.S. ASCII character, col. 7, lines 67, and col. 8, lines 1-3).

As to claims 5 and 9, Watanabe et al. teach the first language is comprised of U.S. English characters (a U.S. ASCII English locale, col 7, lines 54).

As to claims 6 and11, Watanabe et al. teach said inputting further comprises utilizing a keyboard (a keyboard is also available as an input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

As to claim 12, Watanabe et al. teach:

a method for testing multibyte character data in an application (testing of the multi-byte functionality of a program, col. 7, lines 55-57);

inputting single byte data (keyboard for inputting a single language, col. 9, line 8, col. 7, line 52);

translating said single byte data into a pseudo character represented by a plurality of bytes (creating a multibyte locale for a single byte language, col. 8, lines 5-6);

utilizing said pseudo character in said application (using the multibyte English locale to test for problems in the program, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claim 13, Watanabe et al. teach displaying said pseudo character using said application (display of multibyte character, col. 8, line 10).

As to claim 14, Watanabe et al. teach the said pseudo character is recognizable as compared to a first language character (creating a visual distinction between a display of regular ASCII characters and a display of a multibyte character, col. 8, lines 9-13).

As to claim 15, Watanabe et al. teach the first language comprises U.S. English (language is English, col. 8 lines 1-2).

As to claim 16, Watanabe et al. teach inputting a string of first language characters wherein each of said first language characters are representable with a single byte (first language is a single byte language, col. 7, lines 52-53).

As to claim 17, Watanabe et al. teach utilizing a keyboard for said step of inputting, (keyboard for input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

As to claim 19, Watanabe et al. teach:

a program storage device embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for testing a multibyte character data in an application (program information for controlling the computer to enable the

computer to perform its testing and development function in accordance with the invention, (col. 9, lines 30-34).

inputting single byte data (keyboard for inputting a single language, col. 9, line 8, col. 7, line 52);

translating said single byte data into a pseudo character represented by a plurality of bytes (creating a multibyte locale for a single byte language, col. 8, lines 5-6);

utilizing said pseudo character in said application (using the multibyte English locale to test for problems in the program, col. 8, lines 45-49).

As to claim 20, Watanabe et al. teach displaying said pseudo character using said application (display of multibyte character, col. 8, line 10).

As to claim 21, Watanabe et al. teach the said pseudo character is recognizable as compared to a first language character (creating a visual distinction between a display of regular ASCII characters and a display of a multibyte character, col. 8, lines 9-13).

As to claim 22, Watanabe et al. teach the first language comprises U.S. English (language is English, col. 8 lines 1-2).

As to claim 23, Watanabe et al. teach inputting a string of first language characters wherein each of said first language characters are representable with a single byte (first language is a single byte language, col. 7, lines 52-53).

As to claim 24, Watanabe et al. teach utilizing a keyboard for said step of inputting, (keyboard for input, col. 9, lines 9-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4,10,18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe et al. as applied to claim 1, 7, 12,19 (respectively) above, and further in view of Miller et al. (5,835,768).

Watanabe et al. do not teach providing a lookup table such that said first language characters can be used to reference said pseudo language characters.

However, Miller et al. do teach the ability to identify locale objects by a lookup table (their corresponding representing numbers, col. 8, lines 38-48).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the application testing system of Watanabe et al. with the lookup table as taught by Miller et al. to increase the efficiency of selectively modifying subcomponents of the globally stated cultural preference, col. 3, lines 1-9).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Leong et al. (5,513,342), Innes (4,595,980), Harvey, III et al. (6,701,428), Raman (5,579,223), and Jain (5,434,776).

Leong et al. teach a graphical user interface display window configuration containing user-readable data, implemented by software.

Innes teaches a distributed, interactive data processing system.

Harvey, III et al. teach providing international services in a computer system, such as those used for inputting and presenting text to a user.

Raman teaches creating multiple natural language version of computer programs.

Jain teaches a system for creating multi-lingual computer programs by dynamically loading messages.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E Shortledge whose telephone

number is (703)605-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis Smits can be reached on (703)306-3011. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
08/04/2004

TĀLIVALDIS IVARS SMITS
PRIMARY EXAMINER